



## THE GOVERNOR'S P-20 COUNCIL

MARCH 16, 2006  
10:00 A.M.

*Notice is hereby given to Members of the Governor's P-20 Council and the general public that the P-20 Council will hold a meeting, open to the public, on March 16, 2006, at 10:00 a.m., at 1700 W. Washington, Governor's 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room, Phoenix, Arizona. Public comment will be taken. The P-20 Council will discuss and may take action on the following Matters. Members will attend either in person or by telephone conference call.*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Call to Order & Welcome  | Dr. Rufus Glasper   |
| 2. Approval of Minutes:<br>a. February 16, 2006   | Dr. Rufus Glasper   |
| 3. Updates & Reports from Committee Chairs & Members<br>a. Steering Committee<br>b. Alignment Project Committee<br>c. Adolescent Literacy Committee<br>d. Data & Graduation Rate Project Committee<br>e. Higher Education Committee | Dr. Rufus Glasper   |
| 4. Presentation: Rigor & Relevance In Arizona<br>a. Rincon High School  | Angela Julien, Principal<br>Karen Schneider, Director for<br>Career & Technical Education |
| b. Peoria Unified School District   | John Mulcahy, Administrator for<br>Career & Technical Education                           |
| 5. Presentation & Discussion: High Schools that Work  | Dr. Gene Bottoms  |
| 6. Call to the Public   | Dr. Rufus Glasper   |
| 7. Announcements and Adjournment  | Dr. Rufus Glasper   |



## GOVERNOR'S P-20 COUNCIL

March 16, 2006

---

**Agenda Item No.** 1.

**Subject:** Call to Order  
Welcome

**Submitted by:** Debra Raeder  
Executive Director

### ----- Background Information -----

Dr. Rufus Glasper will call the meeting to order, welcome any guests, and give a brief overview of the meeting.

---

**Council Action Requested:** None.

**Attachments:** None.



## GOVERNOR'S P-20 COUNCIL

March 16, 2006

---

**Agenda Item No.** 2.

**Subject:** Approval of Minutes

**Submitted by:** Debra Raeder  
Executive Director

### ----- Background Information -----

The minutes from the Governor's P-20 Council's regular meetings held on February 16, 2006 are submitted for review and approval.

---

**Council Action Requested:** Approval of P-20 Council Minutes of February 16, 2006.

**Attachments:** Minutes of February 16, 2006

**MINUTES**  
**GOVERNOR'S P-20 COUNCIL**  
**General Meeting**  
**Thursday, February 16, 2006**  
**1:30 p.m.**

**Location:** 1700 W. Washington  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

**Members Present:** Governor Janet Napolitano, Dr. Rufus Glasper, Cathleen Barton, Amy Besing, Dr. Karen Butterfield for Superintendent Tom Horne, Mark Bryce, Ernie Calderon, Susan Carlson, Dr. Michael Crow, Dr. David Curd, George Dean, Dr. Matthew Diethelm, Gregory Donovan, Bill Estes, Dr. Sybil Francis, Dr. Roy Flores, Harry Garewal, Bob Hagen, Dr. John Haeger, Jack Jewett, Dr. Laura Palmer Noone, Dean Phillips, Cindy Rudrud, Kristen Rex, and Jack Swanson

**Members Absent:** Dr. Angel Cabrera, Lynda French, Vivian Gonzales, Mayor Phil Gordon, Dr. Peter Likins, Cathy McKee, Dr. Douglas Olesen, Dr. Jim Zaharis, Senators Toni Hellon and Harry Mitchell (ex-officio), Representatives Ann Kirpatrick and Laura Knaperek (ex-officio)

**1. Call to Order & Welcome**

Dr. Glasper called the meeting to order at 1:30 pm. He welcomed everyone and indicated that Governor Janet Napolitano would be joining the meeting at 2:00 p.m. Dr. Glasper expressed recognition of the importance of today's meeting as the Council would be hearing a presentation on the Alignment Project Report, which will form the cornerstone for much of the future work of the Council.

**2. Approval of Minutes**

- November 18, 2005
- December 6, 2005

There being no discussion or corrections, Dr. David Curd moved approved of the November 18, 2005 and December 6, 2005 P-20 Council meeting minutes as presented. Motion was seconded by Harry Garewal and unanimously approved.

**3. Presentation & Discussion: Access to Higher Education – JCC Recommendations**

Dr. Larry Christiansen, Dr. John Haeger, and Regent Ernie Calderon presented an update on the JCC recommendations for improving affordable access to baccalaureate degrees.

Dr. Haeger introduced the presentation indicating that Dr. Christiansen would provide an overview on Recommendations 1-4 and that he would discuss the critical issues surrounding Recommendations 5 and 6. Dr. Haeger indicated that the two dominating principles that

guided the work on the recommendations were that Arizona has a good higher education system and that the recommendations would do no harm to what currently exists.

Regent Calderon commented that the consensus reached on the JCC Recommendations was due to Dr. Haeger and Dr. Christiansen and thanked them for their hard work and leadership. Regent Calderon also stated that there has been considerable concern by the private post-secondary institutions, but that the work of the JCC focused on public institutions only.

Dr. Christiansen then updated the Council on the JCC Executive Summary and the first four recommendations:

1. Increase transfer credits for selected programs;
2. Increases the number and scope of community college-university partnerships;
3. Establish joint funding models;
4. Expand Arizona University systems campuses and statewide programs.

Dr. Christiansen provided examples of how these 4 recommendations are already being accomplished through 2+2 and 3+1 programs at various institutions; the NAU/AWC collaborative; UofA/Cochise Community College collaborative; as well as small, but targeted, partnerships between some public and private institutions (e.g. Mesa Community College and Ottawa); and that these types of programs would move forward institution by institution. Dr. Christiansen emphasized that all of these issues must be approached looking at the funding models.

Dr. Haeger then discussed the two issues that originally had disagreement by JCC:

5. Develop a pathway for baccalaureate degrees at community colleges;
6. Explore the need and create a pathway for a 4-year regional degree granting college.

When the JCC was unable to agree on these final two recommendations, Regent Calderon appointed Dr. Haeger and Dr. Christiansen to work as a committee to find a solution. Dr. Haeger indicated that, using a systemic approach, he and Dr. Christiansen worked to reach a compromise that received consensus by the JCC as well as ACCA.

For issue No. 5, developing a pathway for baccalaureate degrees at community colleges, the major issue to be resolved was determining a review process based on established criteria. The review process developed included a process for determining:

- Need;
- Determining the University Program Provider;
- Determining the Non-University Program Provider; and
- Program criteria

For issue no. 6, a pathway for a 4-year regional degree granting college, the process would be the same as outlined for developing a pathway for baccalaureate degrees at community colleges. In addition, the following pre-conditions would need to be addressed:

- Local community college board has indicated both the need and willingness to support expansion of the respective community college mission;
- There is limited university access for students in the region;
- Appropriate accreditation is available and could be obtained;
- Sufficient infrastructure exists to support a baccalaureate degree granting college
- An implementation plan is developed and submitted to JCC, the
- Legislature, office of the Governor, and the Arizona Board of Regents;

- Governance issues are addressed between the community college board, ABOR, the legislature and the appropriate accrediting agencies.

Recommendations 1-4, approved by the JCC in September 2005, were endorsed by the Arizona Community College Association in November 2005 and the Arizona Board of Regents in December 2005. Recommendations 5 and 6, approved at the December 14, 2005 JCC meeting, were approved by ACCA on January 27, 2006 and the Arizona Board of Regents on February 2, 2006.

The Council had a brief discussion on the information presented. Dr. Laura Palmer Noone indicated that the private post-secondary institutions opposed recommendations 5 and 6. Dr. Noone indicated that while she could support the first four recommendations, there were two flaws in recommendations 5 and 6: the recommendations didn't consider the role of private post-secondary institutions nor had they been invited to participate in the discussions; and that the recommendations did not come with a cost analysis. Regent Calderon indicated that the JCC had provided unparalleled access for private post-secondary to provide input and he thought this was a misunderstanding. Dr. Noone indicated she would concede that point. Mark Bryce questioned the costs that were being used in current legislation regarding Recommendation 4 and that the legislation was flawed because of this misinformation. Mr. Bryce also stated that the caveat for his support of the recommendations was that these are not exclusive means for addressing access to higher education. Dr. Glasper closed the discussion stating that these recommendations were monumental steps, that this dialogue on the recommendations would continue and be vetted at all levels, and that the Council would address how to respond to the recommendations at the next meeting of the Council. Dr. Glasper asked for any public comments to this discussion. There were none.

#### **4. Updates & Reports from Committee Chairs**

Pending the arrival of the Governor, Dr. Glasper skipped to the next item on the agenda, Updates & Reports from Committee Chairs. Dr. Glasper updated the Council on the formation of the new Steering Committee, indicated that he will Chair the Committee and that the membership consists of the four Committee Chairs and one at-large member representing business, still to be determined. Dr. Glasper then referred the Council to the new draft forms on the Roles & Responsibilities of the Council and Committees; a Committee information sheet; and a Request for Review Form. Dr. Glasper indicated that the Steering Committee is still working to finalize these forms, but asked for comments from the Council. After brief discussion, George Dean moved, and Dr. David Curd seconded, a motion to adopt the principles of these new draft forms and for the Steering Committee to finalize this framework for the Council. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Glasper then called for a brief break pending the arrival of Governor Napolitano.

#### **5. Presentation & Discussion: Alignment Project Report**

Dr. Glasper reconvened the meeting and welcomed Governor Napolitano. The Governor indicated that she was truly inspired by the Council's great work for Arizona's children. She indicated that the business community, such as GPL and ABEC, has been leaders in the P-20 movement and together advocated for action on assessing Arizona's alignment status. The Governor indicated that we must train students for jobs that pay well, provide a future and an opportunity for a career and give our K-12 students the tools with which to do this. While there have been similar national efforts to look at high school alignment, the Alignment

Project in Arizona is different in that it looks at our state's strengths, weaknesses and opportunities. The Governor also thanked the Arizona Department of Commerce, the Governor's Council on Workforce Policy, the Governor's Council on Innovation and Technology in partnership with the Arizona Technology Council and the Southern Arizona Technology Council for their support in developing this important Report. The Governor cautioned, however, that while high school is the most high profile transition in the P-20 chain, as the Council listens to the presentation and considers the report, we must consider what we need to do before high school to prepare students for a high school experience that will get them the jobs of tomorrow.

The Governor then turned the presentation over to the Public Works team, Steve Bella, Dr. Rob Muller and Sidney Hacker.

Steve Bella provided an introduction of the Report, and that the emphasis of the report was to look at five major industries that have been targeted in Arizona where job growth or development will be occurring, and identify occupations within these industries that meet a defined high-wage, high-demand/high-growth standard and then to identify specific skills, education and training needed for these occupations. This information was then validated with industry focus groups. In tandem with this work, Public Works did an analysis on the preparedness of Arizona's high school students for postsecondary study and the workplace focusing on the adequacy of academic preparation and articulation with requirements for post secondary study.

Dr. Rob Muller indicated that the education section of the report focused on looking at the available student performance data, compared Arizona graduation requirements with post-secondary entry requirements as well as how these requirements compare nationally, examined the state standards and AIMS as a graduation requirement, and extrapolated what this information implies for Arizona's secondary education system. Sidney Hacker then presented the information on how high-wage, high-demand/high-growth occupations were identified within the industries, how the required skills, education and training needed for these occupations were analyzed, how this information was compared to secondary education requirements, and then summarized the roundtable results.

Steve Bella concluded the presentation with the general findings of the Report:

- College readiness needs to be the minimum requirement for high school graduates;
- Arizona high school graduates need to be prepared for both post secondary education and training and careers;
- High School rigor in applied math and reading comprehension is critical;
- Relevance in high school is critical;
- Insufficient data can hinder efforts to improve high school, postsecondary and workforce alignment.

Cindy Rudrud, Chair of the Alignment Project Committee, directed the Council to a form in their packet, and requested that Council members review the Report and provide comment for the Alignment Committee to consider as they begin to develop a framework for acting on the information provided by the Report. This information needs to be provided to Debra by Friday, February 24<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Rudrud then briefly reviewed with the Council her first impressions of the Report.

Dr. Karen Butterfield passed out information on the Department of Education's High School Renewal Initiative and indicated that this Initiative focuses on alignment. Dr. Butterfield

expressed concern about moving too quickly and that the State was just now adjusting to high stakes testing. She also indicated that high school students were taking more advanced placement courses, that more students were taking advanced placement exams, and that scores were improving. Dr. Butterfield also expressed concern that career and technical education was not explored in detail in the Report.

The Council had discussion on the need to implement more rigorous courses as well as relevance into the curriculum; that the State needs to request a Lexile analysis of coursework; that public perception needed to be addressed; as well as the fact that there was a fundamental lack of understanding about education, what it takes to move forward, and on what being educated really means. There was also concern expressed about the current achievement gap in Arizona and how we must address this issue.

Governor Napolitano expressed the urgent need to define the courses required to graduate as well as course content that will prepare students for the post-secondary experience as well as for career readiness. The Governor expressed her willingness to work with Superintendent Horne in addressing the issues surrounding AIMS, high school renewal and graduation requirements. She also expressed the need for higher education leadership to tell us what they expect from K-12 education and then work from there in aligning education standards and graduation requirements. The Governor emphasized the need to move quickly to address the alignment issues and that we must raise expectations. Dr. Glasper stated we have heard the charge, asked the Council members to fill out the Report analysis sheet and return to Debra by February 24<sup>th</sup>, and indicated that the Steering Committee will begin to develop a framework to prioritize the issues. Dr. Glasper stated that there is an urgency to develop recommendations and move forward to align Arizona's P-20 system.

The Council had further discussion on the horrendous amount of funding spent on remediating students in community colleges; that the need to look at the data achievement gap is critical; that there is a need to set the bar high enough to do service to students; to have an integrated system; that there is a base level of education everyone needs to obtain regardless of their career pathway; the need for more resources; and the need to move aggressively to set the standard.

## **6. Call to the Public**

Anna Ciceros, a school counselor with the Mesa Public Schools District and representative of the Arizona School Counselors Association, addressed the P-20 Council and once again thanked the Council for their hard work. Ms. Ciceros indicated that Counselors are in the trenches proactively working to help the Council reach its goals.

Barbara Border, the Interim Director for Career & Technical Education, addressed the P-20 Council on the work ADE is doing to insure that academics and competencies are integrated into CTE standards. Ms. Border indicated that 65% of completers of CTE courses have successfully passed the AIMS test.



David Jones, President of the Arizona Contractors Association, stated that the construction industry is facing a crisis in meeting workforce demands. Mr. Jones indicated that the Association appreciated the opportunity to be invited to participate in the Alignment Project roundtables so that industry members could provide input into the Alignment Project Report.

Marie Mancuso addressed the P-20 Council regarding the standards development process, and that the standards are developed for all students. The Standards Committee consists of a majority of educators. Dr. Mancuso agreed that there is a huge awareness issue because the majority of their feedback is that the standards are too rigorous.

Mary Wolfe, Program Director for the Arizona Academic Scholars Initiative, addressed the P-20 Council regarding public perceptions of current rigor of education. She indicated that the Arizona Academic Scholars Initiative is now in 13 high schools around the state. Ms. Wolfe asked for the Council's support in bringing this initiative statewide so that every student can participate. Ms. Wolfe also expressed concern that students are opting out of difficult courses their senior year in order to improve their GPA.

## **7. Announcements and Adjournment**

Dr. Glasper announced that the next Meeting of the P-20 Council is March 16, 2006 at 10:00 a.m.

There being no further business, Dr. Glasper adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.



## GOVERNOR'S P-20 COUNCIL

March 16, 2006

---

Agenda Item No.	3.	Presented By:
Subject:	Updates & Reports from Committee Chairs and Members	Dr. Rufus Glasper
Submitted by:	Debra Raeder Executive Director	

### ----- Background Information -----

This item provides P-20 Committee Chairs and Council Members an opportunity to provide update information and reports to the Council. Committee chairs will update the Council on the Roles & Responsibilities of each Committee. Dr. Glasper and staff will also provide an update on the next steps for the Alignment Project Report.

- A Steering Committee
- B Access to Higher Education Committee
- C Adolescent Literacy Committee
- D Alignment Project Committee
- E Graduation Rate Project Committee

#### Future Committee Meeting Dates:

**Alignment Project Committee:** April 5, 2006 @ 2:30 p.m.  
**Adolescent Literacy Committee:** March 21, 2006 @ 10:00 a.m.  
**Data & Graduation Rate Project Committee:** April 6, 2006 @ 2:00 p.m.  
**Higher Education Committee:** March 28, 2006 @ 11:00 a.m.  
**Steering Committee:** March 29, 2006 @ 2:30 p.m.

---

**Council Action****Requested:**

As requested by P-20 Committee Chairs and Council Members

**Attachments:**

The Alignment Project Report: Overview and SWOT Analysis Update

Committee Meeting Minutes (unapproved) the Steering Committee meeting on March 2, 2006

P-20 Council Roles & Responsibilities Sheet

P-20 Committee Information Sheet

P-20 Request for Review Form

# FROM EDUCATION TO WORK: IS ARIZONA PREPARED? THE ALIGNMENT PROJECT REPORT



## **The Problem:**

Arizona's secondary system is not well aligned with the requirements for post-secondary study and the workplace.

## **Report Findings:**

- College readiness needs to be the minimum requirement for high school graduates
- Arizona high school graduates need to be prepared for both college and career
- High school rigor in applied math and reading comprehension is critical
- Relevance in high school is critical
- Insufficient data can hinder efforts to improve high school postsecondary and workforce alignment

## **Report Identified Gaps:**

- Graduation requirements are insufficient
- There is a lack of identified college/career course curriculum
- AIMS testing is not aligned to college or career readiness
- Data gaps prevent Arizona from pinpointing alignment gaps

## **Report Suggested Next Steps:**

- Raise graduation requirements;
- Identify a college/career ready course curriculum
- Re-examine the purpose and intent of the AIMS test at the high school level

## **Council Members Suggested Opportunities:**

- Change the graduation standards for high schools ;
- Align the education, training and skill requirements for the high-demand occupations and post-secondary education (look at CTE; relevancy);
- Clearly articulate the needs and expectations for students entering higher education and develop a process to interact with K-12 on entrance skills and knowledge expectations
- Higher Education system to interact with and align employer expectations to skills and knowledge of higher education institution graduates;
- Develop a statewide campaign to show that AZ is supportive in educating our youth to be ready for the AZ of tomorrow

## **Council Members Suggested Threats:**

- Backlash from stakeholders in changing paradigm that college readiness should be the minimum requirement for high school graduates (AZ current standards are low *and* students are not meeting these requirements-will create more dropouts to increase rigor);
- Lack of alignment between stakeholders in resolving the issues (e.g. council members, ADE, Governor's Office, educators) need partnerships not turf battles; finger pointing instead of resolutions (11);
- Lack of attention to CTE Programs; resistance that focus on rigor will squeeze CTE out

## **Short Term Goals:**

- P-20 Council Retreat to develop action plan
- Assign Committee Responsibilities to address Report Findings, Gaps, Next Steps and Opportunities;
- Each committee to establish timeline for work plans

### **Report Strengths:**

#### **List at least three strengths that the Report reveals in addressing alignment issues:**

- 1 Formation of P20 Council to address the issues of workforce preparedness and alignment of high school preparation and graduation requirements with career and academic demands
- 2 Use and analysis of AZ specific data and comparison to national data provides, specific data needed for AZ while lending increased emphasis and credibility by providing corroborating data from other state and national organizations, studies etc. AZ is not alone, nor is it unique. This should allow us to look with confidence at best known methods and approaches that others are employing vs feeling that we must invent and customize every strategy for AZ vs adopting work that shows evidence of success and then leapfrogging ahead with that.
- 3 Business community alignment and commitment to support efforts to improve this situation- ABEC mentioned
- 4 Strong model for coordinating and tracking 2 year to 4 year transitions; AZHSRI cited although I personally know little about its' effectiveness and rigor re: expectations for school leaders
- 5 Infers (but fails to clearly state) that the education, training and skill requirements for the high-demand occupations in the state's growth industries and the education, training and skill requirements for post-secondary education are the same.
- 6 Demonstrates that the Arizona high school graduation requirements and the education, training and skill requirements for the high-demand occupations and post-secondary education are misaligned
- 7 Demonstrates that the result of the gap caused by this misalignment between the high school graduation requirements and the education, training and skill requirements is that Arizona high school graduates are not prepared for the high-demand occupations and post-secondary education.
- 8 Clear and compelling
- 9 Good data analysis and reporting
- 10 Although report does not make recommendations, these can readily be mined from the findings.
- 11 Employers & post-secondary institutions in AZ in agreement with national trend to ensure that graduates have both hard and soft skills
- 12 AZ has a system for coordination, transition from 2-4 year post secondary
- 13 AZ has defined the industries for growth
- 14 There is a surprising degree of agreement among experts on the appropriate high school curricula for success
- 15 In Arizona we are fortunate to have high job growth and there will be opportunities for those that are prepared for them
- 16 The report does a good job at pinpointing the key areas of concern. Depending on how we intend to use it though, I would suggest some improvements. If the report is going to become part of the P-20 recommendations and the public report, I would suggest that it be made sharper and shorter. It is important to outline up-front what the conclusions are, and to tie all the data to those

conclusions In the current version, the conclusions are buried on page 76, and it's not totally clear how some of the data reported help support those conclusions

- 17 We have a data set that indicates issues that need to be addressed.
- 18 Identification of key industries and skills required
- 19 The need to align high schools and higher ed in "tracking" student/school/higher ed successes and failures (i.e. the data gaps)
- 20 Has "rigor" been defined?
- 21 Roundtable discussions indicate that business community is interested in Arizona education
- 22 Findings are concise, understandable and specific.
- 23 Findings do a good job of identifying gaps which need to be addressed.
- 24 Findings should serve as a solid foundation for formulating action items to correct existing gaps
- 25 Sets out opportunities for working together
- 26 Helps us prioritize efforts
- 27 Creates a vision for a P-20 SYSTEM
- 28 Our post secondary education institutions are the gatekeeper for our workforce and a terrific information source for our secondary institutions. Communication is what's missing
- 29 The workforce that will be demanded in the future is more sophisticated, and we must believe that we have the children who can fill the demand. We just need to challenge our children appropriately and then give them the tools to do so.
- 30 The investigation into industry/occupations needed for future economic growth is thorough
- 31 The report clearly indicates that post secondary training is necessary for all and that a gap exists in the supply of workers adequately trained
- 32 The use of both objective and subjective data is a strength; the round tables corroborated the objective findings
- 33 Points out that RELEVANCE in the classroom is required
- 34 Is a good comprehensive response to the issues?
- 35 Allows for the fact Arizona is not the only State with this issue
- 36 Smooth transitions for students between high schools, community colleges and universities
- 37 Aligning the high school exit requirements to the higher ed entrance requirements
- 38 To build a better prepared workforce to strengthen the AZ economy

### **Report Weaknesses:**

#### **List at least three weaknesses that the Report reveals in addressing alignment issues.**

- 1 The report needs to state somewhere that part of the difficulties students are having in high school is the fact that they are not prepared for high school and that our ultimate objective must be to push our strategies back to address readiness of children for learning even prior to entering Kindergarten
- 2 We need better data across the whole system, not just about the students who need remedial assistance when they enter college. We need a clearer picture of what data we need and how it can be used in decision making to improve educational outcomes.
- 3 Does not address the broader necessity for alignment from K to 20, thereby assuming that students coming into the high school system are aligned with its requirements.
- 4 Fails to clearly state that the requirements for post-secondary education and the workforce are the same; does not distinguish that preparation for post-secondary education is not "tracking" a student into post-secondary education and away from the workforce.
- 5 Is not direct and concise (while it is convoluted / circumspect and verbose / repetitive) that the reader will not take in the data nor draw out the intended information
- 6 I don't agree that we should set a standard that all graduating seniors must be college ready. That does a disservice to those students who are economically and educationally challenged and/or prefer to have a non-College prepared career. College should not be marketed as perfect for everyone. It is good for those who are suited for it. We must always recognize there will be a hardworking, respected segment of society that will be in non-College prepared jobs
- 7 I am alarmed at the condemnation of the AIMS test. I am no fan of the AIMS test. The AIMS test is suspect already by its own imperfections. But to infer that we need a super AIMS test to test college proficiency would inadvertently place another obstacle to those students who do not do well under standardized testing but who will do well in a less stressful (more real life) educational environment
- 8 No alignment between higher education and secondary education, leaving students graduation from high school not prepared for career and/or higher education at that point or at some later point in that person's life.
- 9 AIMS is a 10<sup>th</sup> grade test at best, lacks significant rigor resulting in the fact that while some students may pass it (and many do not), it again is no indication of readiness and success in the workplace or in post secondary education. Less than rigorous standards, compounded by less than aggressive performance levels required to pass the test, do not lead to high expectations for students. Also cited is a decline in % of students taking the ACT exam. Only 6% of juniors and seniors take AP exams although AP classes are offered in 67% of High Schools
10. Common lack of understanding that the preparation for career and higher education are virtually one and the same vs 2 separate and differently academically challenging paths. Common lack of understanding about the skills and education required for many jobs/careers often still inappropriately thought to require less rigorous and lower level skills.
11. No comprehensive system K-20 to look at data, articulation and transition issues etc
- 12 Significant achievement gaps exist and for a state with a high Hispanic and Native American population this can be devastating
- 13 In evaluations done by national organizations it would appear that AZ is reducing the rigor needed for HS graduation

- 14 Significant gap between current requirements for high school grad & admission requirements of post-secondary institutions
- 15 There is no comprehensive data system in AZ
- 16 By 2013 there will be an oversupply of individuals NOT finishing degrees and an under supply of individuals with bachelor's degrees
- 17 Despite the knowledge of what a successful high school experience looks like, our high school districts and state graduation standards are much lower
- 18 We aren't preparing HS grads for jobs that will pay a living wage
- 19 An area that I miss in the report is the role of foreign language instruction Table 4 on page 33 shows a gap not only in Math and Science, but also in Foreign Language instruction: AZ Diploma currently has no requirement, while the three universities require 2 years Either universities ought to drop the requirement (as ADP and High Schools that Work seem to imply) or AZ high schools should incorporate it as a graduation requirement (as the universities implicitly believe, and also ACT and the Education Trust)
- 20 In my humble opinion, incorporating foreign language skill to the high school requirement list makes sense for a number of reasons First, doing so would obviously take care of the current misalignment between high schools and colleges But most importantly, it would help increase AZ's competitiveness in the world economy, and it would turn a current weakness (the "English as a second language" issue) into a competitive strength The problem of English language proficiency among Hispanics has a powerful, though often ignored, positive side: the widespread command of a foreign language that is among the world's three most dominant languages and is the language of a whole subcontinent south of the border Miami has been able to exploit its biculturalism and turn it into a key economic asset So could (and should) Arizona
- 21 The second area which I was surprised not to see reflected in the report is that of computers and information technology Computer literacy is an absolute must for any job of a minium complexity (and wage level), not just in the IT industry, but across the board I would like to understand how and why such important skill didn't make to the "finals" in the analysis of occupational requirements I believe computer literacy is a key tool for further learning (college alignment) and for job performance (career alignment) and it should be established as a key priority for all high schools
- 22 No relation between high school graduation and college entrance requirements
- 23 Weak high school graduation requirements
- 24 Limited ways for the various sectors to communicate
- 25 The report admits the exclusion of data and critical information from CTE: AZ CTE does need to be explored in more detail; ADE's CTE has good data and CTE program info to share that could be helpful to the Council
- 26 Clarification re: AP stats in AZ: Include the most recent data (from The College Board's latest national report; AZ has made significant gains, and through ADE's IDEAL portal and its API grant, all schools will have access to AP in some capacity) Certainly, we still have a ways to go, but it's a start
- 27 The report lacks how others besides business (schools, organizations, agencies, initiatives) are addressing alignment, rigor, career/high ed preparation What can we attain from these efforts, as an initial step?
- 28 K-12 schools are not preparing all students to move to college or careers.



29. High school curriculum needs to open pathways for college or career
30. Common language and articulation with all educational levels P-20 Consistency and alignment issues
31. Significant gap between current requirements for high school grad & admission requirements of post-secondary institutions
32. There is no comprehensive data system in AZ
33. By 2013 there will be an oversupply of individuals NOT finishing degrees and an under supply of individuals with bachelor's degrees
34. Report doesn't offer specific recommendations on how identified gaps can best be closed, i.e., it looks to the main board to formulate them. Hopefully, Public Works will continue to provide post-report advice in this regard
35. Report doesn't offer examples on how other states have successfully dealt with similar issues. Hopefully, Public Works will be available to share such information in going forward from here
36. Report doesn't identify costs and needed other resources to correct gaps.
37. That Az content standards are low in relationship to needs in the workforce or higher ed
38. That the AIMS test really does NOT assess anything relevant to postsecondary needs
39. That the very agency responsible for K-12 preparation is defensive and, though working hard, may be working on the wrong things.
40. One of the biggest weaknesses WE as a state have to overcome is our reliance on measurements and graduation requirements that are not sufficient to equip kids with what they need to prosper after high school. Past political battles aside, if we are relying on the wrong things to tell us if our children are learning what they need to take them into the world, we need to make changes now
41. English language learners and minorities are achieving and attending post-secondary institutions at much lower rates, and we must direct resources to shrink those gaps.
42. The finding that there is an evident lack of communication and agreement between the secondary and post-secondary institutions as to what skills our students really need is something that will have to be addressed first and foremost. There should be a solid line of communication between the two communities regarding alignment
43. Arizona lacks a system to move students from high school to postsecondary options
44. The AIMS Test doesn't set the bar high enough as an exit exam; however, it must be noted that AIMS is a tenth grade test
45. State standards are not sufficiently rigorous; this conclusion seems based on the degree of specificity of the AZ Academic Standards rather than the content and concepts outlined in the standards. I would like to see an analysis of the reading and writing standards, which are now articulated by grade level. Could ACT do this for us?
46. Does not emphasize that ALL high school students are told what they must take to go to "college"

- 47 Over emphasizes that the "State" does not require enough academics for graduation
- 48 Too much discussion about AP and ACT/SAT, without comparative reasons for what the issue really is
- 49 Arizona is "lowering the bar" for graduation from high school at a time when many other states are raising their standards
- 50 Raising standards (to more accurately reflect the requirements for post-secondary education and the workforce) would result in far greater numbers of students failing over the next several years.
- 51 Many parents as well as school counselors encourage students to take easier courses (to get high GPA) rather than take more rigorous curriculum which would increase their probability of success in college
- 52 Pressure on K-12 to raise graduation requirements when students still struggle with AIMS
- 53 Potential higher drop out rate for AZ.
- 54 Impact on institutions to comply with statewide data system reporting
- 55 Not taking into account student, community, family, and cultural issues when discussing increasing accountability

## **Report Opportunities**

### **List at least three opportunities revealed by the Report that you believe the Council should address first.**

- 1 Address the gap in understanding/recognition of eligibility requirements for university attendance and begin moving towards alignment in this area
- 2 Address need for data and the use of data in decision-making
- 3 Align the education, training and skill requirements for the high-demand occupations and post-secondary education. Develop and implement a detailed plan and schedule to do so
- 4 Utilize the (clear and concise) findings of the Report to create a “call to action” for all aspects of the K-20 system, parents and students as well as the concerned business community and the general public. Develop and implement a detailed plan and schedule to do so
- 5 Utilize the (clear and concise) findings of the Report to develop a “pulpit” to directly connect higher high school graduation requirements and students’ lifelong success in the workforce. Develop and implement (prior to the issuance of any Council recommendations) a detailed plan and schedule to do so
- 6 Embrace the 4 high school preparation themes to reform AZ policy (4 themes on page 24)
- 7 Review AZ standards and performance expectations
- 8 Develop industry driven skill standards. Focus on higher median wage occupations – min \$16.38 per hour
- 9 We must change the graduation standards for high schools
- 10 Colleges and Industry are willing to assist and we should capitalize on that willingness to identify the standards necessary
- 11 Make the university admission requirements, the graduation requirements from high school
- 12 Bolster the number and quality of high school math and science teachers
- 13 Invest, Invest, Invest
- 14 Accepting the Gov’s recommendation to work hand-in-hand with the Superintendent in identifying courses high school students need for graduation; identifying together the content of those courses. This is a most welcomed first step
- 15 Working together in taking a look at AZ’s high school graduation requirements (Social Studies: increase to 3 credits, just as AZ Scholars is doing: this is a natural step to take)
- 16 Coordinating other P-20 high school renewal efforts (i.e. ADE’s AZ High School Renewal & Improvement Initiative and the research of Breaking Ranks II; ABEC’s AZ Scholars Program; GPL, CFA’s graduation rate work, etc. etc)
- 17 Articulation and values set with input from all stakeholders for what students need for college and career

18. Develop a statewide campaign to show that AZ is supportive in educating our youth to be ready for the AZ of tomorrow
19. Look at education and past practices. Time required by state for school attendance. Elementary, middle school, and high school all have different required times. Middle school has the longest amount of time with student. Why not all this time to high school to continue to develop career pathways as well as prepare students for college?
20. Short term implementation of curriculum changes that would correct the existing gaps between high schools, institutions of higher learning and higher-paying career opportunities in the business community/workplace
21. Identification of resources (both financial and otherwise) to effectively implement the needed curriculum changes.
22. Raise the career awareness and interest level in those occupational areas with the greatest growth potential and prospect of generating a good paying job
23. PR, public engagement campaign advocating high expectations for ALL students
24. Gradual move to increasing graduation requirements
25. Lexile assessment of reading materials in grade 12 compared with lexile assessment of text in various apprentice manuals and assessment of texts and reading lists in higher ed
26. A focus on relevancy of coursework (reading comprehension, critical thinking, applied mathematics)
27. Raising the bar for our graduates because the world demands it and because they can reach it.
28. Opportunity to create a critical, ongoing dialogue of alignment between all of the stakeholders in the P-20 in order to facilitate future, hopefully smaller, realignments. This needs to be a living, breathing process.
29. Overall however, I think the report brings up key areas of improvement that I believe should be adopted as part of P-20's conclusions. Number one is the need to align high school graduation requirements with college admission requirements (based on the increasing need of post-secondary education for most new jobs in most industries). Also the need to increase the rigor of key fundamental areas (math and verbal) and to develop better assessment tools that in line with both college and career readiness
30. I think by better aligning the exit and entrance exams, making the data system more robust, and providing more feedback from employers and the higher education to K-12 it will do more than anything to enhance articulation and quality. I also believe that if we require the four year plan in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade, with annual monitoring, and a postsecondary plan to be filed upon graduation, it will enhance the ability of students to navigate, not only the K-12 system, but their postsecondary opportunities
31. That AZ has the same issues that other states do and that have been documented by national researchers and policy analysts should provide comfort, confidence and direction to AZ as we take on this task
32. General alignment and support by a well intentioned if not as well informed business community. Better educated and informed, this constituency will be a well armed and effective advocate for reform. Support and thanks offered at the last P20 meeting by a member of the construction industry (one often thought not to need well educated workers) for the report and the work being done by the council, as well as the work done by ABEC are good examples

- 33 As the AZ University system looks to re-evaluate it's admission requirements, this could provide the opportunity to re-look at HS gradation requirements in support of the re-evaluated requirements That would seem logical
- 34 AZ Academic Scholars program as well as other successful initiatives give us some best known methods already in place to expand on
- 35 Examine graduation requirements!
- 36 Articulate higher education entry expectations in terms of needed academic skills as well as lists of courses
- 37 Create a system of governance which promotes (requires?) collaboration among entities such as ADE, the State Board of Education, and the Board of Regents.
- 38 Bring more relevance to the high school experience
- 39 Education should lead towards a career.
40. This committee can make recommendations that can have an impact on our education system and create a better alignment
- 41 There is a growing consensus on the kind of curriculum needed to be successful in this new knowledge economy
- 42 There's growing understanding that our high schools are not producing sufficient graduates and that those who do graduate lack the skills/knowledge they need
- 43 Make it crystal clear to students, parents and counselors that a more rigorous curriculum (even with lower GPA) increases probability of success in both college and the workforce
- 44 Improving math and reading skills in early grades positions students to be successful with the more rigorous high school curriculum they need
- 45 The State could create an "Arizona Scholars Diploma" for those students completing the Arizona Academic Scholar curriculum to provide increased recognition (and thus motivation) for students to do so.
- 46 Strengthen teacher preparation and professional development / induction for teachers
- 47 Align systems at the policy level, program level and faculty level
- 48 Increase CTE kinds of program requirements for high school students

### **Report Threats:**

#### **List at least three threats real or perceived that will result from this Report.**

- 1 It is going to be a challenge to persuade the public (including families of students) that college readiness should be the minimum requirement for high school graduates
- 2 Continuation of different and lesser expectations for some students, under-served, economically disadvantaged, and often these expectations are held by teachers vs students and parents who according to the Stanford Bridge project expect that between 70-80% will go on to post secondary education We have sold the story about the importance of post secondary education; our preparation of students has not matched that dream or expectation
- 3 This is not mentioned in the report but the question asks what threats will result from this report. At least the perception that there is less than desired alignment between many P20 council members, the governor and the state superintendent cause concern about really being able to move forward with this agenda in a meaningful way Trying to work on the P20 alignment could be the opportunity to coalesce around the challenge or highlight the divisiveness and impede real action and results
- 4 That the report did not cover CTE may be viewed as a "non starter" for some. It is critical and the report does a good job of mentioning the need to examine further and the role that it plays, but the limited treatment may be a barrier (or be raised as a barrier as a tactic) for some as they look at the thoroughness and credibility of the report.
- 5 The convoluted and verbose Report may lead readers to believe that the alignment problem described and documented therein may be as difficult to solve as the Report is to follow and understand
- 6 The failure of the Report to distinguish that preparation for post-secondary education is not "tracking" a student leaves the Report open to criticism and vulnerability on that point
- 7 The lack of specificity in the Report of the direct relationship between higher high school graduation requirements and students' lifelong success in the workforce leaves open the door for public / parental backlash
- 8 For 85% of projected new jobs, high school graduates will need both college and work experience
- 9 AZ standards may be low and AZ students do not meet the AZ requirements.
- 10 By 2013, 39% of livable wage jobs will require an associate's degree Only 15% of AZ population (age 25 & older) will have attained this degree Report has no mention of the pipeline capacity of post-secondary institutions
- 11 A more rigorous graduation requirement for HS may result in even higher drop out rates among those populations with already low completion rates
- 12 Some school districts will not be able to attract nor afford highly qualified teachers in advanced math and science disciplines
- 13 ADE will be defensive in reaction to the report
- 14 "Vocational" education advocates will resist increasing certain standards
- 15 The P-20 Council will resist taking strong and dramatic action
- 16 Assuming "one alignment plan for all"; there needs to be caution regarding increasing academic standard(s) rigor in a high-stakes test state; not all students will go into high tech/high science/math careers, for example.

- 17 Subjective opinions in the report were very limited. This can cause potential false perceptions.
- 18 Arizona Department of Education and the AIMS not adequately preparing youth for what is needed. Are we comparing apples to oranges?
- 19 Educators that read this will pucker at some of the findings about not preparing students for college and workforce. Counselors at the high school level also were mentioned in areas as to not providing students with what is necessary for them to choose the right courses to be prepared.
- 20 CTE not preparing or not providing what is necessary for students to be successful in college and career.
- 21 Delay (resulting mostly from resistance to change) may be encountered in adopting changes to effectively addressing the gaps identified in the report.
- 22 Lack of complete buy-in, support and/or cooperation from both the educational and employer communities.
- 23 Failure to achieve near-term (or shorter term) results could cause the alignment effort to lose momentum.
- 24 Backlash from parents, educators that in spite of data, level of expectation is okay.
- 25 Resistance from fine arts, CTE and other elective educators that focus on more rigor will squeeze them out.
- 26 Counselors will continue low expectations for some students.
- 27 Increased drop out rate when grad requirements are raised due to lack of interventions.
- 28 Lack of funding for those targeted interventions needed in #4.
- 29 I detected that the Department of Ed felt they were in some way being indicted, when I believe the real intent was to provide us with the market research we need to jointly move forward. I hope a partnership and not a turf battle can be created.
- 30 The idea of change can often cause special interests to be pitted against one another. Politics and dividing up sides over changes will always be a threat to an expeditious and impactful resolution.
- 31 There may be pushback from parents who are not fully educated about the purpose and scope of alignment. Selling the message of why there is an absolute need for a major shift in how we think of high school is going to be critical if we are going to get parents and students to step up to the challenge.
- 32 Resources must be available if high schools are to change; professional development is critical.
- 33 The current accountability system (AIMS and the State Standards) drives the K-12 system. Changing will require careful planning and will meet resistance.
- 34 Public perception of public education could become problematic if the recommendations of the P-20 Council are not framed appropriately. Recognition that Arizona is not the only state with the issues we are discussing will be important. The fact that we are aggressively dealing with the need to better prepare students should be viewed as a very positive position.
- 35 The committee will be afraid to make real recommendations.

- 36 This will become a partisan issue
- 37 This will become a power struggle between the legislature, Department of Education and the governor's office
- 38 Many parents will reject the assertion that their child needs three years of math, three years of science, four years of English to be successful in the workforce.
- 39 The State legislature is likely to agree with them (parents) and not provide the resources needed to provide such a curriculum
- 40 A threat to current K-12 teachers who are currently working hard at failing schools.
- 41 The impact on teachers, faculty and professors to align curriculum for quality preparation in literacy, math and science
- 42 Blaming people not the systems



**P-20 Council  
Steering Committee Meeting  
March 3, 2006  
Meeting Minutes**

**Location:** 1820 W. Washington, Suite 100, Phoenix, Arizona.

**P-20 Members Present:** Dr. Rufus Glasper, Dr. Sybil Francis, Dr. Jim Zaharis, Kristen Rex, Cindy Rudrud, Bill Estes (telephonic)

**Staff:** Debra Raeder, Dr. Cheri St. Arnauld, Lorie O'Brien, Becky Hill

**1. Call to Order**

Dr. Glasper called the meeting to Order at 3:30 p.m. and welcomed Bill Estes to the Committee. As Mr. Estes was attending the meeting telephonically, Dr. Glasper invited everyone present to introduce themselves.

**2. Approval of Meeting Minutes – January 13, 2006**

There being no discussion or corrections, Kristen Rex moved approved of the January 13, 2006 meeting minutes as presented. Motion was seconded by Cindy Rudrud and unanimously approved.

**3. Review/Discussion/Approval:**

- a. P-20 Council Roles & Responsibilities Sheet**
- b. P-20 Council Committees Sheet**
- c. P-20 Council Proposal Submission Sheet**

Debra presented the revised draft of the P-20 Council Roles & Responsibilities Sheet, indicating that minor changes had been made and requesting review and input from the Committee. By consensus, the Committee agreed to remove the caption, **Role of the P-20 Council**, and make this sentence the last sentence under the Purpose paragraph. The Committee also made some minor verbiage changes to the first paragraph.

Debra presented the revised draft of the P-20 Council Committee Sheet and indicated that major changes had been made to almost all of the committee descriptions and asked each Committee Chair to review and provide comment and approval. After discussion on the committee descriptions, and by consensus, the Committee also altered the names of two committees to more accurately reflect their goals and responsibilities. The Access to Higher Education Committee was re-named the Higher Education Committee; and the Graduation Rate Project Committee was re-named the Data & Graduation Rate Project Committee. The changes to the committee descriptions and titles will be included in the Newsletter being developed.

Debra indicated that no changes had been made to the P-20 Proposal Submission Sheet.

The Committee adopted by consensus the Role of the P-20 Council Sheet and the P-20 Council Committees Sheet as amended, and the P-20 Proposal Submission Sheet. This information will be included in the Newsletter and posted to the website.

The adopted forms are attached.

#### **4. Communication Tools**

Cheri and Debra updated the Committee on the Newsletter being prepared. Cheri presented a draft of the newsletter for review and discussion. This first Newsletter includes national information on education initiatives, P-20 Councils, as well as information on Arizona's P-20 Council, committees and initial work. The Committee critiqued the Newsletter and made several corrections and edits, which will be incorporated into the Newsletter. The Committee also recommended that some type of visual be included on the back page of the Newsletter. Debra and Cheri will work on an initial graphic to be included, but would be developed by the Council over time. It is anticipated that the Newsletter will be ready for distribution in March.

#### **5. Alignment Project**

Debra indicated that 19 members of the Council had provided input on the SWOT Analysis of the Report and she had compiled this information, which she presented to the Committee for their initial review and comment. Cindy Rudrud, Chair of the Alignment Project Committee, provided a brief overview of the major findings/gaps that are specifically identified in the Conclusion of the Report. Cindy indicated she needed guidance on how the Alignment Project Committee should proceed with the Report.

Dr. Zaharis presented for discussion a recommendation for a framework on how the Council could proceed – see attached.

Committee members discussed some concerns identified in the report as well as the need to require Algebra I by the end of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade year; the skill sets expected from universities for high school graduates; how other states are addressing these issues; and information from ACT on the crosswalks they did with the ACT test and Arizona standards. The Committee also expressed the need for information on:

- Definition of college readiness – universities need to articulate and we need a process for this dialogue to take place;
- Baseline for the work done by ACT;
- Understanding what courses/content are needed to raise high school graduation requirements.

Committee agreed to the following first steps:

- Facilitated study session in early summer for the P-20 Council to evaluate the report and establish framework as well as to determine where the work will be done – full Council or by committee;
- Have other states present to the committees or council (or both) on their process for alignment;
- Process for universities to articulate what is needed.

#### **6. Committee Discussions:**

Due to time constraint, committee reports will be tabled until next meeting. Question was posed on what the next steps would be for the Council and the Higher Education Committee regarding the JCC recommendations. Brief discussion regarding the recommendations and that they are a very good start in considering policies that will impact the future of higher education in Arizona. Dr. Zaharis will meet with Darcy Renfro and Dr. Glasper to discuss possible next steps.

#### **7. P-20 Council Meeting - March 16, 2006 Agenda Update**

Debra indicated that working with and in cooperation with ABEC, we have arranged for Gene Bottoms from *High Schools that Work* to do a presentation on integrating Career & Technical Education and core curriculum. *High Schools That Work* is based on the belief that most students can master complex academic and technical concepts if schools create an environment that encourage students to make the effort to succeed.

#### **8. Next Steps/Future Meeting Dates**

There was no discussion by the Committee on a future meeting date.

#### **9. Adjournment**

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

# GOVERNOR'S P-20 COUNCIL ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES



## PURPOSE OF THE P-20 COUNCIL:

In order to bring business leaders, policy makers and educators to the table, the P-20 Council was established by Executive Order No. 2005-19 on July 8, 2006. The primary purpose is to improve education in Arizona by integrating policy, curriculum, assessment through data development, and system support, assuring quality education at all levels, to ensure more students graduate from high school, succeed in post secondary training and become ready for the modern workforce. The first year focus for P-20 is on: defining linkage problems across the system; prioritizing issues through such information as community reports, presentations, and invited experts; identifying gaps; and providing recommendations to the Governor to improve P-20 education through rigor, relevance, resources, relationships and resolve. The Council will provide input, support, direction, recommendations, and advocacy for high performance in education in Arizona to ensure that the State will be competitive in the global economy.

## ROLE OF STEERING COMMITTEE:

The committee is charged to make recommendations to the P-20 Council (the Council) regarding priorities and strategies that will support the Council achieving its stated purpose to improve education in Arizona. The Committee may perform additional functions as assigned by the Council.

### The Steering Committee assumes the following responsibilities:

1. Assures integration of the vision, mission, and strategies into the activities of the Council and its Committees
2. Reviews and evaluates information, programs and policies as appropriate for the P-20 Council
3. Responds to interests and concerns of the Council membership
4. Reviews, updates and communicates the work of the Committees to the Council.
5. Ensures that results and recommendations from studies or reports are communicated to the Council
6. Provides recommendations for strategies and policies for review by the Council
7. Supports priorities and activities of the Council

## Steering Committee Members:

**Chair:** Governor Janet Napolitano  
**Co-Chair:** Dr. Rufus Glasper  
**Executive Director:** Debra Raeder, Executive Director for the Governor's P-20 Council

### COMMITTEE CHAIRS:

**Adolescent Literacy:** Kristen Rex, Principal, Glassford Hill Middle School, Humboldt Unified School District  
**Alignment Project:** Cindy Rudrud, Administrator for High School Initiatives, Peoria Unified School District  
**Data & Graduation Rate:** Dr. Sybil Francis, Executive Director, Center for the Future of Arizona  
**Higher Education:** Dr. Jim Zaharis, Vice-President, Greater Phoenix Leadership  
**Member-at-Large:** Bill Estes, Jr., The Estes Company & Southern Arizona Leadership Council (Business Rep)  
**Advisory Staff:** Becky Hill, Governor's Policy Advisor for K-12 Education  
Darcy Renfro, Governor's Policy Advisor for Higher Education

## ROLE OF COMMITTEES:

Committees are established by the P-20 Council's Chair and Co-Chair, with recommendations from the Steering Committee, for the purpose of carrying out the Council's assigned duties.

## ROLE OF COMMITTEE CHAIR:

1. Chairs all scheduled Committee meetings
2. Establishes goals and monitors the progress of the Committee pursuant to needs of the Council
3. Facilitates Committee meetings to meet the purpose and goals of the Committee
4. Updates the P-20 Steering Committee on Committee activities and progress
5. Communicates Steering Committee decisions and appropriate information to respective Committee

## P-20 COUNCIL COMMITTEES



### **Adolescent Literacy Committee**

Chair: Kristen Rex  
Principal, Glassford Hill Middle School

The initial first step to inform the P-20 Council's work on Adolescent Literacy was Governor Napolitano's request to the Alliance for Excellent Education to assist Arizona. In compiling a report for Arizona, the Alliance analyzed student achievement data, reviewed local education policy trends, and interviewed educators, business leaders, and other prominent figures in all parts of the state to solicit their ideas on how best to reform literacy instruction in Arizona. The Adolescent Literacy Committee/Advisory Panel will address the issues surrounding Adolescent Literacy in Arizona and develop a state literacy plan for the P-20 Council using the Alliance's Report as a guide.

### **Alignment Project Committee**

Chair: Cindy Rudrud  
Administrator for High School Initiatives, Peoria Unified School District

The Alignment Project Committee will work to systemically address educational alignment in programs and policies in the P-20 education continuum that will ultimately meet the education and skill requirements for high-wage occupations in Arizona. To begin this process, the P-20 Council commissioned a study to assess the alignment of K-12 public education with post-secondary study and workforce demands. This Report will form the cornerstone of the work of the Alignment Project Committee as it develops recommendations for the P-20 Council to improve the alignment of K-12 schools with college and workplace expectations. The final goal is that all students graduate from high school well prepared to succeed in post-secondary study and careers.

### **Data and Graduation Rate Project Committee**

Chair: Dr. Sybil Francis  
Executive Director, Center for the Future of Arizona

The objectives of the Data and Graduation Rate Committee are to enable data-driven decision-making for improving high school graduation rates and alignment of the P-20 educational pipeline. A first step will be to recommend actions for meeting the goals of the National Governors Association (NGA) Graduation Rate Compact, and for linking data systems across the entire education pipeline from preschool through postsecondary education. Additional goals of the NGA compact include: implementation a standardized four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; upgrades to state data collection systems, reporting and analyses; implementation of additional indicators that deepen our understanding of student outcomes and how well the system is serving students; annual progress reports on improvements in state high school graduation rates, completion, and drop-out rates.

### **Higher Education Committee**

Chair: Dr. Jim Zaharis  
Vice-President, Education  
Greater Phoenix Leadership

The purpose of the Higher Education Committee is to examine access to higher education issues such as accessibility, affordability, articulation, capacity and completion. The Higher Education Committee will strive to provide a link between postsecondary institutions and the K-12 system in identifying and implementing recommendations to the P-20 Council to improve alignment with college expectations so that all students graduate from high school well prepared to succeed in post-secondary study and ensure degree completion.

### **Steering Committee**

Chair: Dr. Rufus Glasper  
Chancellor, Maricopa Community Colleges

The charge of this committee is to make recommendations to the P-20 Council on priorities and strategies to achieve the Council's goals related to improving education in Arizona. The Steering Committee will assure the integration of the vision, mission, and strategies into the activities of the Council and its committees, review and evaluate information, programs and policies as appropriate for the P-20 Council and respond to the interests and concerns of the Council membership. The Steering Committee will also review, update and communicate the work of the Committees to the Council, ensure that results and recommendations from studies or reports are communicated to the Council and develop strategies and policies for review by the Council.

## **P-20 Council: *Request for Review Form***



The process for submitting proposals to the P-20 Council is as follows:

1. A proposal must be made in writing.
2. Proposals will include:
  - a. A title page
    - i. Name, title and contact information of person submitting request
    - ii. Title of proposal
    - iii. The issue that is addressed and its relevance to the P-20 Council goals
    - iv. Brief summary statement of purpose
  - b. Justification/Explanation
    - i. Discussion of the purpose and proposed action(s)
    - ii. List of contributors to proposal
    - iii. List of resources used to identify the issue, develop the idea
    - iv. Include any other references, as needed
3. Proposals are to be sent to the P-20 Executive Director.
  - a. Proposals will be reviewed by the P-20 Council Co-chairs and the Executive Director. After review, proposal will be submitted for consideration by members of the P-20 Steering Committee.
  - b. Proposals will be evaluated based upon the following criteria:
    - i. Relevance to P-20 Council purpose and goals
    - ii. Timeliness: appropriate for immediate attention, or possible later consideration
    - iii. Pertinent to existing committee, or requiring new committee formation
4. All proposals will be acknowledged and responded to in a timely manner.



## GOVERNOR'S P-20 COUNCIL

March 16, 2006

---

**Agenda Item No.** 4.

**Subject:** Presentation: Rigor &  
Relevance in Arizona

**Submitted by:** Debra Raeder  
Executive Director

### ----- Background Information -----

Angela Julien, Principal of Rincon High School and Karen Schneider, Career & Technical Education (CTE) Director for Rincon High, and John Mulcahy, the Administrator for Career and Technical Education (CTE) in the Peoria Unified School District (PUSD), will be describing efforts their districts have made to integrate CTE with core subjects. In an effort to bring rigor *and* relevance to high school instruction, Rincon High School and the PUSD have pursued a variety of integration strategies which will be described in their presentations.

---

#### Council Action

**Requested:** None.

**Attachments:** PowerPoint presentations

## Integrated Learning

"Planned integrated curricula focusing on the enduring understandings needed in today's world will bring true learning within the reach of all students."

*Gene Bottoms, High Schools That Work*

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## The Search for Rigor *and* Relevance

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Integrated Learning

- Intentional curriculum and instruction restructuring that links or clusters knowledge and skills to provide students with greater curricular coherence, rigor and relevance.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



### Three Major Types

- **Infusion Strategy:** Incorporates academic concepts into CTE or vice versa. Applied Academic Courses are an example.
- **Multidisciplinary Strategy:** Coordinates courses with a common core of results and assessment methods. Example: Career Pathways
- **Linked Strategy:** Connects two courses so that concepts are taught in a way that clarifies the relationships between the disciplines.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Benefits

- Helps students see connections between school and the real world:  
Students who use academic knowledge and skills in the context of broad career fields and workplace standards begin to recognize their own aptitudes and interests and formulate how they might apply this to life beyond high school.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### More Benefits

- Helps students understand major concepts, themes and theories from more than one discipline
- Connects the enduring understandings
- Engages students actively through research questions, thematic topics and projects that relate content to real life

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Still More Benefits

- Integrated Learning emphasizes the communication, mathematics, science and technology and workplace skills needed for success in our world.
- Instructional focus should be on preparing students for a variety of post-high school experiences

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### And a Few More Benefits

- Integrated learning allows students to learn by doing rather than by listening
- Students solve problems, observe adults' use of knowledge, talk with workers in real occupations and create products and reports
- Students gain greater understanding of connections between school-based learning and their own interests and needs

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### And, of course....

- How people learn in the real world: Integration draws on the brain's inherent tendency to seek relationships to put things in context and learn from experience.
- Example: Physics principles are more easily understood when seen in action in an automotive lab.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### PUSD Linked Strategies

- Business/Language Arts
- Drafting/geometry
- Algebra/computer programming
- Senior Language Arts/Internship
- Building Trades/Geometry

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### More PUSD Linked Strategies

- Family and Consumer Science and Language Arts
- Biology and Agricultural Sciences
- Medical Science and Biology
- Automotive Technology and Physics
- Building Trades and Drafting

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### PUSD Infusion Strategies

- "Advanced English Applications"

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### PUSD Multi-disciplinary Strategies

- French revolution theme across World History, Drafting and French
- Research study on the impact of selected fertilizers on tomato production across agricultural sciences and biology

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Process

- Encourage Integration
- Provide opportunities
- Provide professional development

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



## GOVERNOR'S P-20 COUNCIL

March 16, 2006

---

**Agenda Item No.** 5.

**Subject:** Presentation &  
Discussion: High  
Schools that Work

**Submitted by:**  
Debra Raeder  
Executive Director

### ----- Background Information -----

Dr. Gene Bottoms, founding director of the Southern Regional Education Board's High Schools that Work (HSTW), will provide information to the Council on the nation's largest school improvement initiative to raise the achievement of career-bound students. More than 1,000 schools in 23 states have adopted HSTW's framework of goals and key practices. The program offers a challenging academic foundation with a career/technical or academic concentration to prepare high school students for the workplace and further education. Dr. Bottoms is the recipient of numerous awards for his work in helping high schools improve curriculum, instruction, and student learning.

---

#### Council Action

**Requested:** None.

**Attachments:** None.



## GOVERNOR'S P-20 COUNCIL

March 16, 2006

---

**Agenda Item No.** 6.

**Subject:** Call to the Public

**Submitted by:** Debra Raeder  
Executive Director

### ----- Background Information -----

This item provides Council members an opportunity to hear public comment on agenda items. Comments not specific to agenda items, according to open meeting laws, may not be addressed by the Council.

In order to ensure that all individuals desiring to speak during the public comment period be properly acknowledged and to allow sufficient time for the comments, we ask that a "Request to Speak" information sheet be completed and submitted to either the Council Chair or staff prior to the beginning of the meeting. **Comments are limited to three minutes.**

---

**Council Action Requested:** None

**Attachments:** None



## GOVERNOR'S P-20 COUNCIL

March 16, 2006

---

**Agenda Item No.** 7.

**Subject:** Announcements  
Adjournment

**Submitted by:** Debra Raeder  
Executive Director

### ----- Background Information -----

**Announcements:**

- a. Next Meeting of the P-20 Council: April 13, 2006
- b. Other

**Adjournment.**

---

**Council Action Requested:** None

**Attachments:** None